DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 585 UD 027 730

AUTHOR LeFlore, Larry
TITLE Black Juveniles in the Juvenile Justice System: A Cause for Alarm.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Youth; *Child Welfare; Delinquency; *Juvenile Justice; Laws; *Policy Formation; *Racial Composition; Racial Discrimination
IDENTIFIERS Policy Issues

ABSTRACT

This report examines the representation of black youth in the juvenile justice system, describes changes in juvenile justice philosophy, and discusses policy implications. Black youth are overrepresented at all stages of the juvenile justice system compared to white youth. Positivist theories explain this overrepresentation as the result of pathological environmental conditions that have a negative impact on the psychosocial development of blacks. Conflict theories explain this overrepresentation as the result of racial and economic biases that discriminate against blacks throughout society. The following philosophies have guided the development of the juvenile justice system since its inception in 1899: (1) rehabilitation philosophy emphasized protection of the youth's best interests; (2) due process philosophy emphasized individual rights; and (3) radical nonintervention theory emphasized reducing the negative effects of the system on youth. Recent developments emphasize an adversarial system that is concerned with accountability and punishment. Policymakers and researchers should address reforms in the system that emphasize the values, needs, and norms of the black community. Statistical data are presented in one table. A list of 45 references is appended. (FMW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325585

BLACK JUVENILES IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM:

A CAUSE FOR ALARM

Larry LeFlore, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Department of Criminal Justice
University of Southern Mississippi
Hattiesburg, Mississippi

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larry LeFlore
Univ. of Southern Miss.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

UD 027 750

ABSTRACT

The present study examines the relationship between black youths and the juvenile justice system. Particular concern is focused on (1) the disproportionate number of black youths throughout the system; (2) the changing philosophy and theory of juvenile justice; and (3) implications for policy makers, practitioners, and juvenile justice scholars.

INTRODUCTION

Black youths are disproportionately represented throughout the official juvenile justice system. As a result of this phenomenon, they are an obvious presence in the official crime and delinquency statistics. Moreover, the general public assumes that they are more delinquent than white youths. Furthermore, key players of the system, particularly policy makers (Regnery, 1985) and some researchers, have focused on them as having a greater likelihood of being arrested for criminal activity (Wolfgang, Figlio, Sellin, 1972) and as having lives that are replete with pathology (Moynihan, 1965). In spite of this focus, these key players in the system have been ineffectual in ameliorating factors that may increase black youths' chances of coming into contact with the juvenile justice system. One would be hard pressed to identify a direct link between public policy strategies and the reduction of delinquency rates among black youths. Rather, one may easily find support for the claim that the official crime and delinquency problem among blacks seems uneffected by formal efforts, and an increasing proportion of black youths is being filtered into the juvenile justice system (Dept. of Justice, 1986). This argument is supported in data garnered by the Justice Department, the U.S. Census Bureau, and the National Center on Juvenile Justice.

This article is designed to examine this phenomenon. It will focus on the extent of black youth representation throughout the juvenile justice system. In addition, it will report on the changing philosophy, theory, and practice of juvenile justice as it has undergone

tremendous change since the time when blacks were sparsely represented as wards of the system to today when they are most disproportionately represented. The purpose of this article is to illuminate the relationship that exist between black youths and the juvenile justice system. At present, it seems to be one in which black youths are not receiving maximum benefits. There is a need for policy direction and change; thus, this paper has a third major section that includes implications for juvenile justice practitioners, policy makers, and scholars.

THE EXTENT OF BLACKS IN THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM AND "WHY"

Black youths are most visible throughout the juvenile justice system--the arrest stage, the court stage, and the corrections stage (Crime in the United States, 1985; National Center for Juvenile Justice, 1982; U.S. Census Bureau, 1983). According to official statistics, several conclusions are made about black youths. This section will summarize them beginning with arrest reports.

The Justice Department's Crime in the U.S. (1985) reports that black youths account for twenty-three percent of all juvenile arrest. With respect to serious juvenile crimes (murder, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, larceny, auto theft, and arson), they account for 52 percent of all arrests for personal or violent crimes while white youths account for the 46 percent of the arrests for this type crime. Thus, the black to white ratio is 1:1. With respect to serious property crime arrests, black youths represent 25 percent and white youths represent 72 percent for a black/white ratio of 1:3. Status-offense type crime arrests present a different picture. These arrests are for crimes

such as vandalism, sex offenses, drug abuse, liquor law violations, disorderly conduct, curfew violations, and runaway. Black youths are less likely than white youths to be represented in these arrest data. The juvenile crime statistics indicate that whites accounted for 83 percent of arrests involving vandalism while blacks accounted for 16 percent (ratio=5:1); whites accounted for 73 percent of arrests involving sex offenses compared to 26 percent accounted for by blacks (ratio=3:1); whites accounted for 77 percent of arrests involving drug abuse while blacks were responsible for 22 percent (ratio=3:1); whites accounted for 95 percent of arrests involving liquor law violations and blacks accounted for three percent (ratio=31:1); whites accounted for 93 percent of arrests involving drunkenness and blacks accounted for five percent (ratio=19:1); whites accounted for 85 percent of arrests involving disorderly conduct compared to blacks 14 percent (ratio=6:1); whites accounted for 74 percent of arrests involving curfew violations compared to blacks 24 percent (ratio=3:1); and whites accounted for 85 percent of arrests involving runaway while blacks accounted for 13 percent (ratio=7:1). All of these arrests involving these type behaviors are usually referred to the juvenile courts for processing. Moreover, police referrals make up the larger proportion of youth court referrals. Other referrals to the court are made by parents, neighbors, schools, etc., and blacks seem to be more heavily represented in these as well. This fact is supported by the National Center for Juvenile Justice (NCJJ). The Center reports that "the most common source of referral for both racial categories was law enforcement, although black cases were more likely than white cases to be referred to the court by sources other than law enforcement (1987:29)."

In addition to collecting data on referral sources, the NCJJ collects data on juvenile court activity which includes court decisions from intake through disposition processes. A major caveat is in order when interpreting their data, however. With respect to race particularly, the Center did not include racial composition of the counties' youth population in its analysis of data, thus, no claim of national estimates should be made (NCJJ, 1987:29). Thus, the data reflects the likelihood of racial differences (pp. 29-32), and they are the best that exists on a national level. From them it is concluded that blacks (24%) are more likely to be detained prior to court than whites (19%). A more in-depth examination of the decision to detent by race suggests that black youths are more likely to be detained for personal crimes than are white youths (31% versus 29%, respectively) for property offenses (23% versus 19%, respectively), drug related offenses (24% versus 17%, respectively), public disorder offenses (26% versus 23%, respectively), and status offenses (12% versus 11%, respectively).

In addition, black youths are more likely than white youths to continue through the court process as reflected in the cases processed for formal hearing by the filing of a petition. Fifty-one percent of black youths compared to 41 percent of white youths had petitions filed in their cases. An examination of the various categories for referral reveals that 63 percent of black and 53 percent of white youths are likely to have their cases petitioned against them when there is a personal crime involved, 45 percent of black compared to 37 percent of white youths are likely to have petitions filed against them when a public disorder offense is involved; and 19 percent of black versus 20 percent of white youths are likely to have petitions filed against them

when there is a status offense involved. Moreover, black youths have a greater likelihood than white youths of being adjudicated delinquent after a hearing on the petition (33.6% versus 26.6%, respectively). Furthermore, black youths are twice as likely to have their cases waived from juvenile court to adult criminal court. NCJJ reports that of every 1000 black cases that are processed beyond intake, 21 are waived to criminal court. This compares to only nine for every 1000 cases involving white juveniles. If the court retains jurisdiction, the likelihood of being placed on probation is greater for white youths (28%) than for black youths (26%), while the likelihood of being placed outside of the home is greater for blacks (11%) than for whites (7.6%).

For a look at the racial distribution of youths incarcerated, the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics' Children In Custody (1983) data provide a source for analysis. It reports that there was an increase of 5,035 minority youth incarcerated in public correctional facilities--a rise of 26 percent for the period from 1977 through 1982 (p. 7). Of this amount, black youths represented 67 percent. This means that the black youth population grew from 34 percent of all incarcerated youths in 1977 to 38 percent of all youths incarcerated in 1982. Present youth court activity and juvenile arrest profiles present no reason to believe that this percentage of black representation will decrease. In some instances, juvenile justice observers posit that new policies in various state legislations which require incarceration and mandated longer periods of detention for specific types of crimes may account for additional increases in the number of blacks in correctional facilities (Krisberg et al., 1986; Petersilia and Turner, 1985). Table 1 presents a detailed summary description of data extracted

from the most recent Children in Custody report (1983). It shows that black youths are on any one day disproportionately represented in not just public juvenile training schools, but in ranches and camps and in group homes and halfway houses. In addition, there is a consistent increase of blacks in all but one type of the facilities from 1977 to 1979 and from 1979 to 1982. The only exception is for group homes and halfway houses. In these type facilities, blacks represented 36 percent of youths in 1977, 33 percent in 1979, and 35 percent in 1982. The white youth percentage declined steadily for both the 1979 and 1982 years, which suggests that other minorities were being brought into those facilities. Another glaring statistic in the table is that there is a greater percentage of black youths in training schools than at either ranches and camps or group homes and halfway houses for each of the years reported. This is not true of the white youth population for either type facility or year. Furthermore, Table 1 shows that black youths are more likely to be committed to a public training school than to be committed to any type private facility. On any one day in 1982, blacks accounted for 39 percent of youths in public training schools and 25 percent of youths in all private facilities. Looking at the larger number of blacks in public facilities versus private facilities, such differential use may be a function of several factors peculiar to private facilities such as costs, selective admission practices regarding minority youth or the court may be involved in selective placement of youths in these facilities (Krisberg et al., 1987). We know that historically private facilities have excluded minority youths and other alternatives had to be found (Billingsley and Giovannoni, 1972).

Why is there a disproportionate number of black youths in the juvenile justice system seems to be an appropriate question. There are two general answers to this question, however, there is inconclusive empirical research to support either. Although the present study is not designed to analyze such conclusions, it does seem appropriate to address them in general terms.

The first answer is that black youths are more delinquent as a result of the pathology in various areas of their community or environment. This reason has been suggested by positivist theorists who have attempted to relate delinquency with family, individual, community school and other areas that impact upon socialization processes. Although there is conflict in the literature regarding delinquency among blacks in most of these areas, there is more convincing evidence in some than in others. They question biological factors which may have adversely affected their mental abilities on their biochemical processes; they question psychological problems due to socialization processes that have not produced the development of a healthy ego, superego, and the ability to delay gratification; they question psychosocial development and speak to the lack of proper training and socialization in dominant societal norms; all seem to assume the positivist position that if delinquency is related to these problem areas, they can be amerliorated. One variable with strong relationship between blacks and delinquency is school (school performance, success, etc.). Another variable that seems to have importance in explaining black youths delinquent behavior is economics; it may be the most powerful of all as it impacts more profoundly on the total existence of blacks in ways that are different for other racial/ethnic groups

in this society (with exception to the native Americans, probably).

This brings us to the second reason for the disproportionate representation of black youths in juvenile justice--the juvenile justice system reflects the values and attitudes of the larger society; it is a microcosm; it is replete with all the socio-politico-economic biases that operate throughout the society. More specifically, black youths are disproportionately represented in the juvenile justice system (largely) because of their unattractive and inferior social, political, and economic status in the American Society. This view is supported in the findings of studies which have taken a critical look at the experience of black youths at various points in the juvenile justice system (Krisberg et al., 1987; Huizinga & Elliott, 1987; Fagan et al., 1987; Gibbons, 1977; Thornberry, 1978; Krisberg & Austin, 1978; Williams & Gold, 1972; Piliavin & Briar, 1964). As with other groups that are powerless, the system operates against them rather than for them. This assertion is upheld in tenets posited by conflict theorists regarding the privileges afforded the powerful to make rules controlling the actions of those less powerful (Darendorf, 1959). The early history of attempts to handle the problems which juvenile justice systems commonly handle today are clear evidence that those persons who were economically and politically powerful were the chief architects in the designing of control systems for juveniles exhibiting undesirable behaviors (Krisberg & Austin, 1978). In addition, those in power positions define those that are deviant and a threat to their interests. However, more recent studies have not found support for the discriminate labeling of children by race (Black & Smith, 1981; Morash, 1984) or economic status (Morash, 1984) at the arrest stage and other stages have not

been isolated for examination of these variable relationships.

The empirical research may not be the only source for examining racial or economic biases in juvenile justice. Policy evaluation revealing the extent of disparities in the representation of blacks in various stages of the juvenile justice, may be another source for explaining why racial and economic biases exist in this system. We know there is a rich body of research which shows that disparities exist in the experience of blacks not only in comparison to whites, but even in relation to other minority groups. Additionally, this research is clear documentation of how actions at the practice level within the system disproportionately impinges upon the experience of black youths.

THE JUVENILE JUSTICE SYSTEM

The juvenile justice system may be discussed in several ways. Some have discussed it as a social concept (Empey, 1982). As a social concept, it involves a set of values, attitudes, and beliefs that are most specifically related to the way we look upon children, their unique social status, the need to guide and protect them in order to assure their most positive development toward adulthood. Related to this concept is a set of procedures and guidelines that are written into statutory law of each state, the District of Columbia, and U.S. territories. These guidelines and procedures were formally created in 1899 and are maintained today as a socio-legal institution that does several things supposedly for the "best interest of children." It draws attention to parents responsibility to children and it draws attention to the behavior of children. All of this is for the

preservation of community and society.

During the present decade, the juvenile justice system seems to be more identified as a social control agent. As such, it operates without primary guidance from positivist theoretical persuasions that dominated the original juvenile court. It is a product of change due to the changing nature of our society as are other social concepts and systems. The balance of this section will consist of a brief summary of the major philosophies that have guided the procedures of juvenile justice since its formal inception in 1899. An awareness of these philosophies and especially the one that dominates the system today may facilitate appreciation for the "cause for alarm".

The rehabilitation and/or child saving was the first philosophy to dominate the juvenile justice system. It reflected very well the positivist notions (1) that individuals are products of life within their society; (2) that our behavior is determined by forces beyond our individual control; (3) that delinquent behavior is analogous to a disease and can be isolated and eradicated; (4) that the system of juvenile justice should be treatment either to protect society or to help one's individual circumstances or both; and (5) that treatment should be comprehensive in that it should include family, friends, the social and economic environments in order to be affective (Faust and Brantingham, 1979). As these ideas were incorporated into juvenile court statutes, justice in the juvenile justice system became synonymous with rehabilitation in every state across the country (Romig, 1978; Cullen, Gilbert, and Cullen, 1982). As such the youths brought within the court's purview were not to be adjudicated guilty for criminal acts; they were to be treated in ways that would protect their best interest and

ameliorate conditions that may cause further delinquent behavior. This philosophy dominated the juvenile justice system for more than sixty-five years until it gave ground to the due process philosophy in the 1960s.

Due process philosophy was the dominant philosophy of juvenile justice in the decade of the sixties. Its major principles are aligned with the rights given individuals in the U.S. Constitution. Its assumptions include the following: that delinquency (as well as neglect and dependency) is caused by an inadequate environment and that poor parental care is a major culprit; that delinquents are not the same as other children who may fall within the purview of the juvenile court; that the court should not stigmatize children; and that when children have a chance of losing their liberty, they should be eligible for certain procedural rights (Faust and Brantingham, 1979). Major thrusts that contributed to the dominance of due process was the successful arguments that the juvenile court under the rehabilitation philosophy was not fulfilling its promise to children; they were not being treated or cared for, and the state was proving itself to be a poor parent for youths.

Several major developments were noticed that characterized concern for due process issues. The first of these was the revision of welfare codes in California in 1961 and family court codes in New York in 1962. In each of these states, youths were granted the right to legal representation when before the juvenile court (Brantingham, 1977:259-268). Then in several landmark cases, youths won significant protections. For examples, Kent v. united States (1966) gave them the right to (1) a hearing on waive to adult court, (2) access to social service reports,

and (3) a statement of reasons to waive a child's case from juvenile to adult criminal court; In Re Gault (1967) youths gained (1) the right to adequate notices of the charges, (2) the right to be advised by counsel for youth and parent, (3) the right against self-incrimination, and (4) the right of confrontation and cross-examination of witness in delinquent cases where there is a likelihood of losing their liberty; and In Re Winship (1970) they were given the right to be adjudicated on a standard of proof that was more rigorous than the preponderance of evidence or clear and convincing evidence. If they were in a position to lose their liberties, the standard of proof should be consistent with the Fourteenth Amendment due process clause (which is proof beyond reasonable doubt). The overall effect of these cases on the system is that youths could be treated as criminals, but within a non-criminal court; the court has to justify interfering into one's lives and give youth an opportunity to defend themselves in a system that lies somewhere between civil and criminal court.

Although due process continued to guide juvenile justice process after the 1960s, it was not dominate in either the 1970s or the 1980s. In the 1970s, radical non-intervention was the dominant philosophy. Its major impetus came from labeling theorists (Lemert, 1967, 1974; Schur, 1971, 1973) who held that the best public policy regarding delinquent youths is to "leave them alone whenever possible" (Schur, 1973:155); the manner in which the juvenile justice system processes children had more damaging than helpful effects on them. This philosophy, therefore, suggested four major system strategies--due process for youths before the court, decriminalization of some behaviors that are defined as delinquency, deinstitutionalization of youths in secure

facilities that are having negative influences on them, and diversion away from the juvenile justice system of as many youths as possible. In addition, this philosophical thought posits that community-based correctional programs such as halfway house/group homes may be better alternatives that the closed facilities (National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, 1973; Juvenile Justice Delinquency and Prevention Act, 1974).

The result of this philosophy on juvenile justice include (1) less status offenders were committed to closed institutions (such as training schools) and there were monies made available for a brief experiment with community based programs in most states. As the 1970s came to an end, the monies dwindled away and the system seemed to focus less on status offenders and more on the delinquent offender. It was their deviant behaviors that seemed to get the attention of policy makers, and their behavior was reported as a major threat to society. The result was that the system should be tougher, rehabilitation was not successful and money was not available to deal with the problems of these "bad kids." A new philosophy was on the scene as early as 1977 as reflected in the revised Washington State statutes. This new philosophy is more popularly labeled as "just desert." It is aligned with the punishment tenets of classical theory; however, its position on punishment is supported by the notion that it protects the child from the ineffective and abusive strategies of the rehabilitative system (Gaylin and Rothman, 1976; Fogel, 1979; Empey, 1982).

This philosophy expresses no concern for the problems that may impact on a child's life and that may cause delinquent behavior. In addition, it does not support any interest in modifying one's behavior

while one is incarcerated or under other court restricitons. Rather, it supports punishment because the person has done wrong and as such deserves to be punished.

The impact of these ideas on the juvenile justice process is seen in the reform of several states' statutes. This reform expresses the need for severe penalty when handling the criminal youthful offender (Rubin, 1980), and is seen in various sections of youth court statutes from the purpose clause to dispositional alternatives (see Forst, Fisher and Coates, 1985; California Welfare and Institutional Codes, 1976; Virginia Juvenile and Domestic Relations Law, 1977; Washington Juvenile Reform Act, 1977; New York Senate Bill 1-A, 1978; Washington, D.C. Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act, 1970). These reforms affect intake procedures, lowering of age youth court jurisdiction, determinant sentencing, and provisions which allow for easy waiver to adult court. Reform in this direction is not consistent throughout the fifty states; however, the concept and procedures of juvenile justice are far from the original ones, and the system particularly seems less sensitive to the need for comprehensive prevention and treatment of blacks who are becoming more disproportionally represented in it at increasing rates. Rather, the emphasis seems to be focused on control.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Black youths are over-represented at all stages of the juvenile justice system. The extent of their representation is explained in part by several, general theoretical sets of ideas. Among them are positivist and conflict theory. In addition, black youths (as well

as other minority and majority youths) are subjected to a set of juvenile justice system procedures that seems to be less influenced by the original rehabilitation philosophy of the earlier juvenile court. Rather, there is increasing influence by classical ideas and greater pressure for a more adversarial type system in which accountability and punishment are the purposes for system intervention. Consequently, a significant number of jurisdictions has entertained the notion of reform and/or implemented drastic juvenile justice reform that is more commensurate with controlling than prevention or treatment concerns. What implications do these phenomena suggest for black youths and the black population? In addition, what implications do they suggest for policy makers, practitioners, and researchers. It is these questions on which this latter section will focus.

The general and paramount implication is that there is a cause for alarm. Particularly, the black community should sense a greater threat to its (tenuous) stability in a society where it has been disenfranchised throughout its history. More frequently, the black juvenile is more likely to be regarded as less deserving of a special social position--youth (one who is qualitatively different from adults) as they are being looked upon as having culpability (mens rea, doli incapax) and as such are more likely to experience more litigation and more punishment in the system.

From a public policy perspective, this may not be regarded as a racial discrimination issue. Rather, it may be viewed simply as unintended consequences in attempts to objectively control crime (see Petercilia and Turner's Guideline-Based Justice: Implications for Racial Minorities, 1985). This brings us back to the earlier point

regarding the need to examine public policy and its impact on the representation of blacks in juvenile justice. These policies reflect the society's definition of childhood, what is delinquent behavior, and the differential application of control mechanisms.

Attempts to explain and understand the conditions which facilitate racial and economic biases in juvenile justice may be identified in policies which influence the system. Such policies are reflective of the norms and values to which the policy makers subscribe. These policy makers, who may include legislators, agency administrators, planning committees, and task force members may not be representative or responsive to those most negatively impacted upon by the policies (Davidson, 1985). Historically, policy makers have come from the ranks of the upper-socio-economic level individuals (Platt, 1969, 1974). Policies developed within such ranks to govern those who are nonmembers tend to be overwhelmingly reflective of principles to maintain, sustain, and expand the norms and values of those in power. The "public officials and administrators merely carry out the policies decided upon by the elite; policies flow downward from the elite to the masses; they do not arise from mass demands" (Dye, 1978:25; see also Thorton et al., 1987). Policies developed and implemented in this fashion may explain the present philosophy of punishment that is dominating juvenile justice and the fact that black and other minorities are denied certain services and/or experience differential application of juvenile justice statutes at the arrest stage or other stages of the system (Billingsley & Giovannoni, 1972; Davidson, 1985; Husband, 1980; Thornberry, 1973; Thorton & Doerner, 1987; Piliavin and Briar, 1970).

The implication is that there is a need for policies that are

sensitive to the values, needs, and norms of blacks. Davidson's model (1985) may be used as a guide for developing and implementing such policies. Her model focuses on planning and development, content of decision making, implementation, and quality and appropriateness of services. Each element of the plan may be used to facilitate greater sensitivity to concerns of blacks. In addtion, the plan expresses the notion that those individuals, who lack requisite knowledge of the system and the experience of black youths, will not contribute to the development of policy. Thus, it is imperative that policy makers be informed. Black policy makers and others should be knowledgeable about the possible impact of their policies on the clients of the system.

In addition to policy makers having knowledge about ethnic groups and blacks, Leigh (1985) asserts that there is a need for such knowledge to be translated into practice. This assertion seems most appropriate for the practitioners of the juvenile justice system. The system should accept the responsibility for recruiting, training, and preparing practitioners to be more responsive to black youths in a less negative way. This is applicable at every stage of the juvenile justice process.

According to Joe (1987), there is a need to improve the economic positions of blacks and to improve black youths expectations regarding their earning power. Related to this need, Joe (1987) asserts that "community organizations and service-delivery providers have to broaden their perspectives to include economic issues as part of their agendas" (p. 389).

There is a need for critical research in the area of policy development, implementation and impact as related to the juvenile

justice system. In addition, scholars should address legal as well as sociological variables. ". . .the behaviors of officials in criminal justice agencies has sociological as well as legal explanations" (Duffee & Siegel, 1971:386). The findings of these research efforts should be incorporated into juvenile justice policy and programming. These studies should address each phase of the system from police surveillance to release from parole; they should also include longitudinal designs. The result will be the realization that the problems of juvenile justice and the over-representation of black youths is multidimensional. Davidson's plan (1985) that focuses on planning and development, the content of decision making, implementation issues, and the quality and appropriateness of services will prove a most valuable guide. Her plan is (again) ethnic senstive and considers the reality of behavior for group membership and social order concerns as well.

SUMMARY

There is a consensus that black youths are over-represented in the juvenile justice system. Both positive and radical perspectives have offered explanations for this phenomenon in spite of contradicting findings that are advanced by research guided by them, respectively.

Because blacks are over-represented in the system is cause for alarm, especially in light of the fact that the system is not effective in helping them or ameliorating the conditions that may cause them to be delinquent. In addition, the present system is being dominated by control rather than prevention ideals which may result in standardized processing that would bring more blacks into the system given the

emphasis placed on certain behaviors as more threatening than others, the nature of policing in our society, and powerless positions of blacks. Actions that include the ideas discussed in the previous section are the logical sequence at this time.

TABLE 1

One Day Count of Black v. White Representation in Juvenile Facilities*

	1977	1979	1982
One day count	(53%)	(53%)	(46%)
Public Juvenile Training Schools	37%	36%	42%
Ranches and Camps	(56%)	(51%)	(97%)
	26%	28%	30%
Group Homes and Halfway Houses	(62%)	(60%)	(58%)
	36%	33%	35%

1982		
Ranches and Camps	Training Schools	All Private
(66%)	(52%)	(65%)
22%	39%	25%

*The percentages in the parentheses are for white youths.

References

Billingsley, A., and Giovannoni, J. M. (1972). Children of the storm: Black children and American child welfare. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Black, T. E., and Smith, C. P. (1981). Reports of the National Justice Assessment Centers, A preliminary national assessment of the numbers and characteristics of juveniles processed in the juvenile justice system. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

California Welfare and Institutional Codes. Section 202. (1976).

Cullen, F. T., Golden, K. M., and Cullen, J. B. (1983). Is childsaving dead? Attitudes toward juvenile justice rehabilitation. Journal of Criminal Justice 11, 1-13.

Dahrendorf, R. (1959). Class and class conflict in industrial society. Palo Alto, California: Stanford University Press.

Davidson, M. E. (1985). Civil rights and child welfare. In Handbook of Child Welfare, by Joan Laird and Ann Hartman (eds.). New York: The Free Press.

District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act (Public Law 91-358). (1970).

Duffee, D., and Siegel, L. (1971). The organization man: Legal counsel in the juvenile court. Criminal Law Bulletin 7, 544-549.

Dye, T. (1978). Understanding Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Empey, L. T. (1982). American delinquency: Its meaning and construction. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.

Fagan, J., Slaughter, E., and Hartstone, E. (1987). Blind justice? The impact of race on the juvenile process. Crime and Delinquency, 33, 224-258.

Faust, F. L., and Brantingham, P. J. (1979). Juvenile justice philosophy. St. Paul: West Publishing.

Federal Bureau of Investigations. (1986). Crimes in the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Fogel, D. (1979). We are the living proof: The justice model for corrections. Cincinnati: Anderson.

Forst, M., Fisher, B., and Coates, R. (1985). Indeterminate and determiniate sentencing of juvenile delinquents: A national survey of approaches to commitment and release decision making. Juvenile and Family Court Journal, 36, 1-12.

Gaylin, W., and Rothman, D. J. (1976). Introduction. In Doing Justice by Andrew von Hirsch, pp. xxi-xli. New York: Hill and Wang.

In Re Gault (1967). 387 U.S. 1, 87 S. Ct. 1428, 18 L.Ed. 2d 527.

In Re Winship (1970). 396 U.S. 358, 90 S.Ct. 1068.

Huizinga, D., and Delbert, S. E. (1987). Juvenile offenders: Prevalence, offender incidence, and arrest rates by race. Crime and Delinquency, 33, 224-258.

Husband, C. (1980). Culture context and practice: Racism in social work. In Radical Social Work Practice by Michael Brake and Roy Bailey (eds.). London: Edward Arnold Publishers, Ltd.

Joe, T. (1987). Economic inequality: The picture in black and white. Crime and Delinquency, 33, 287-299.

Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act as amended by Public Laws 94-503, 95-115, 96-509, and 98-473. (1974).

Kent v. United States (1966). 383 U.S. 541, 16 L.Ed. 2d 84, 87 S. Ct. 1045.

Krisberg, B., and Austin, U. (1978). The children of Ishmael: Critical perspectives on juvenile justice. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Co.

Krisberg, B., Schwartz, I., Fishman, G., Eisikovits, Z., & Guttman, E. (1986). The incarceration of minority youth. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota/Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.

Krisberg, B. M., Schwartz, I., Litsky, P., & Austin, J. (1986). The watershed of juvenile justice reform. Crime and Delinquency, 32, 5-38.

Lemert, E. M. (1967). The juvenile court--quest and realities. In The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice Task Force Report: Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.

Lemert, E. M. (1974). Beyond Mead: The social reaction to deviance. Social Problems, 21, 457-468.

Morash, M. (1984). Establishment of a juvenile police record. Criminology, 22, 97-111.

Moynihan, D. P. (1965). The Negro family: A case for national action. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.

National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals. The Task Force Report on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (1973). Washington, D.C.: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration.

New York Senate Bill 1-A. Cal. No. 1 (1978).

Petersilia, J., & Turner, S. (1985). Guideline-based justice: Implications for racial minorites. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation.

Piliavin, I., & Briar, S. (1964). Police encounters with juveniles. American Journal of Sociology, 70, 206-214.

Regnery, A. A. (1985). Getting away with murder. Policy Review, No. 34, pp. 1-4.

Romig, D. (1978). Justice for our children. Lexington, Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Rubin, H. T. (1980). Juveniles in justice. Santa Monica, California: Goodyear Publishing Company, Inc.

Schur, E. M. (1971). Labeling deviant behavior. New York: Harper and Row.

Schur, E. M. (1973). Radical nonintervention: Rethinking the delinquency problem. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Thornberry, T. (1978). Race, socio-economic status, and sentencing in juvenile justice. In The Children of Ishmael: Critical Perspective on Juvenile Justice by B. Krisberg and J. Austin (eds.). Palo Alto: Mayfield Publishing.

Thorton, W. E., Voigt, L., & Doerner, W. G. (1987). Delinquency and justice. New York: Random House.

Virginia Juvenile and Domestic Relations District Court Law. (1977).

Washington Juvenile Justice Act. Sec. 55; Sec. 65. (1977).

Williams, J. R., & Gold, M. (1978). From delinquent behavior to official delinquency. In Children of Ishmael: Critical Perspectives on Juvenile Justice by B. Krisberg and J. Austin (eds.). Palto Alto:

Mayfield Publishing.

Wolfgang, M. E., Figlio, R. M., & Sellin, T. (1972). Delinquency in a birth cohort. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.